

## **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the detailed examination evidenced by the Office Action. Applicants request reconsideration of the objections to the specification and rejection of the pending claims for the reasons provided below.

### **Amendments to the Specification Overcome the Objections**

The related application section has been amended to recite specification has been amended to refer to "patent application" instead of "patent". Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objection to the related application section has been overcome.

The specification has been amended throughout to refer to Internet address locations within quotation marks. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objections relating thereto have been overcome.

### **Amendments to the Claims to Address Certain Formalities**

Claims 1-3, 12, and 13 have been amended to provide minor corrections to certain formalities. More particularly, Claims 1-3 and 13 have been amended to remove the recitations of "step". Claim 12 has been amended to replace the recitation of "means for" with "configured to". No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

### **Claims 1-3, 11, 12, and 13 are Patentable Over Hofmann**

Claims 1-3, 11, 12, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0009016 to Hofmann et al. ("Hofmann").

Claim 1 has been amended to emphasize that the method provides user role-specific views of an aggregated service, and now recites:

1. A method of providing user role-specific views of an aggregated service in a computing network, the aggregated service comprising one or more software resources, the method comprising:

providing a user role-specific portlet for each user role supported by a particular one of the one or more software resources;

providing linkage between the user role-specific portlets and the user roles for the particular one of the software resources;

repeating providing a user role-specific portlet and providing linkage between the user role-specific portlets and the user roles for the particular one of the software resources for each of the one or more software resources;

obtaining, at run time, a user role corresponding to a user of the aggregated service; and

using the obtained user role to programmatically select a corresponding one of the user role-specific portlets for each of the software resources, thereby providing the user role-specific view of the aggregated service.

Accordingly, user role-specific portlets are provided for each user role supported by software resources. At run time a user role corresponding to a user is obtained and used to programmatically select a corresponding one of the user role-specific portlets for each of the software resources to provide user role-specific view of the aggregated service.

In sharp contrast, Hofmann is directed to "a single presentation manager 113" that "accesses information from ... a plurality of content sources 101A to 101C in response to a request from a plurality of user devices 102A to 102F", "identifies the presentation requirements of the particular user device, and then transforms the information, if necessary, using a presentation scheme specific to the user device so that the information can be presented on the particular user device." (Hofmann, Para. 60). Accordingly, the presentation manager 113 identifies the presentation requirements of a particular device on which information is to be displayed (e.g., kind and size of display, type of programming language or data format supported by the user device), and it then transforms the information according to the presentation requirements so that the information can be properly displayed on the user device. (Hofmann, Para. 61).

The Office Action contends on Page 3 that paragraph 61 of Hofmann, which states that "these presentation requirements not only may result from technical necessities, but also may result from an individual user's demands or wishes", discloses the recitation of original Claim 1 of obtaining, at run time, a user role corresponding to a user of the aggregated service. However, it appears that the cited paragraph 61 is the only discussion in Hofmann that appears to discuss presentation requirement in the context of a user's demands or wishes.

Applicants submit that Hofmann does not disclose that user roles are supported by software resources and, accordingly, it does not disclose the recitation of Claim 1 that a user

role-specific portlet for each user role supported by a particular one of the one or more software resources is provided.

Moreover, it appears that Hofmann does not disclose the recitation of Claim 1 that a linkage is provided between such user role-specific portlets and the user roles for the particular one of the software resources. The Office Action contends on Page 3 that Hofmann discloses in FIG. 3 "role-specific portlets 115, 116, and 117 for particular software resources." However, Hofmann shows in FIG. 3 and describes that portlet 115 is a "mail porlet", portlet 117 is "an internal info portlet", and portlet 116 is a "RDF [resource description framework] portlet". Accordingly, none of the mail portlet 115, the internal info portlet 117, and the RDF portlet are a user role-specific portlet.

Although the paragraph 61 of Hofmann states that "these presentation requirements not only may result from technical necessities, but also may result from an individual user's demands or wishes", neither paragraph 61 nor any other portion of Hofmann discloses the recitation of Claim 1 that at run time a user role is obtained that corresponds to a user of the aggregated service.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Hofmann does not disclose the recitation of Claim 1 of using the obtained user role to programmatically select a corresponding one of the user role-specific portlets for each of the software resources, thereby providing the user role-specific view of the aggregated service. As explained above, Hofmann discloses that the presentation manager 113 identifies the presentation requirements of a particular device on which information is to be displayed (e.g., kind and size of display, type of programming language or data format supported by the user device), and it then transforms the information according to the presentation requirements so that the information can be properly displayed on the user device. However, Hofmann does not disclose user role-specific portlets for each software resource, nor does it disclose using a user role that has been obtained to programmatically select a corresponding one of the user role-specific portlets to provide a user role-specific view of the aggregated service.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Hofmann fails to disclose many recitations of Claim 1, and consequently Hofmann does not anticipate Claim 1.

Independent Claims 11, 12, and 13 have been amended as explained for Claim 1 to emphasize that the corresponding system, computer program product, and method provide user role-specific views of an aggregated service, and are submitted to not be anticipated by Hofman for at least the reasons explained above for Claim 1.

The dependent claims are patentable at least per the patentability of the independent claims from which they depend.

**New Claims 14-17 are Patentable Over The Cited References**

New Claims 14-17 further define consumer and administrator user role specific views of an aggregated service and are submitted to provide further basis for patentability over the cited references. Claim 14 recites:

14. (New) The method according to Claim 1, wherein:  
obtaining, at run time, a user role corresponding to a user of the aggregated service comprises assigning a consumer role as the user role when the user of the aggregated service is determined to be a consumer and assigning an administrator role as the user role when the user of the aggregated service is determined to be an administrator; and

using the obtained user role to programmatically select a corresponding one of the user role-specific portlets for each of the software resources provides a consumer-specific view of the aggregated service when the user is determined to be a consumer and provides an administrator-specific view of the aggregated service when the user is determined to be an administrator.

Accordingly, a consumer role is assigned as the user role when the user of the aggregated service is determined to be a consumer, and an administrator role is assigned as the user role when the user is determined to be an administrator. A consumer-specific view of the aggregated service is provided when the user is determined to be a consumer and an administrator-specific view of the aggregated service is provided when the user is determined to be an administrator. As explained above, Hofmann contains no disclosure of providing user role specific views of an aggregate service and, consequently, it is submitted to not disclose assigning a consumer role or administrator role based on the user of the aggregated service, and to not disclose providing a consumer-specific view of the aggregated service or

In re: Schaeck et al.  
Serial No.: 10/081,300  
Filed: February 22, 2002  
Page 15



an administrator-specific view of the aggregated service based on the user role. Consequently, Claim 14 is submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

Claims 15-17 include recitations that correspond to those of Claim 14 and are submitted to be patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons explained above for Claim 14.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the above discussion, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (919) 854-1400.

Respectfully submitted,

David K. Purks  
Registration No. 40,133  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

USPTO Customer No. 46589  
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.  
Post Office Box 37428  
Raleigh, NC 27627  
Telephone: (919) 854-1400  
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401